

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the Amendment mailed June 19, 2003 and this Supplemental Amendment.

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-16 and 18-22 are pending in this application.

Regarding the New Claim 22

The present Office Action mailed September 16, 2003, states that "The reply filed on June 24, 2003 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because . . . . No arguments are set forth as to the reasons for patentability of newly submitted claim 22."

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's patience and hereby sets forth reasons for the patentability of newly submitted claim 22.

As discussed in the previously filed Amendment, mailed June 24, 2003, Becker et al. does not teach using a CPU. Applicant further points out that there is no discussion of any kind in Becker et al that obviates the use of a CPU. There is no motivation or other evidence of record that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to produce the named invention. Furthermore, Rossigno does not remedy the deficiency of Becker et al. and merely teaches the use of an indicator light 170. Taking this discussion one step further neither Becker et al. nor Rossigno, singularly or combined, teach the use of a logic unit. A logic unit is technically a step down from a CPU. Becker et al., at best teaches an analog circuit that is hard wired and not programmable. Rossigno teaches a mechanical and very low-tech electrical tow vehicle breaking system.

Applicant submits that a logic unit is mainly a digital circuit that has a programmable aspect to it. The circuit makes logical boulian math decisions with and/or/Xor circuitry and

memory devices, digital logic inputs from A to D converters, clock counters, and shift registers. Applicant notes that the present application supports a logic unit in that a logic unit is within the scope of the description provided in the specification and drawings. As such, Applicant submits that claim 22 is not anticipated or obviated by the cited art and is thus ready for allowance.

Should the Examiner have any further questions or comments facilitating allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative indicated below to further prosecution of this application to allowance and issuance.

In view of the above, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, P.C.



Steven R. Greenfield  
Registration No. 38,166

Date: Oct 27, 2003

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200  
Dallas, Texas 75202-2799  
(Direct) 214/855-4789  
(Fax) 214/855-4300